

million. More recently, the State Department has put the number at 100 million, or one for every 50 people in the world.

What is known is that on average about 500 people are killed or maimed each week—26,000 every year—by land mines. Huge swaths of ground have been rendered uninhabitable by the sowing of mine fields, from Kuwait to Angola. One of every 236 people in Cambodia is an amputee as a result of mine blasts. Around the world, wherever land mines lie in wait for the unsuspecting or careless, prominent among their victims are children.

But there is an effort under way to do something about this madness. A one-year moratorium on the sale, export and transfer of land mines was adopted by the United States in 1992, followed the next year by unanimous Senate passage of a three-year extension. The moratorium effort has since been joined by 25 other countries.

Late next week, the Senate is expected to vote on The 1995 Land Mine Use Moratorium Act, which:

Urges the president to pursue an international agreement for the eventual elimination of anti-personnel land mines.

Imposes a one-year moratorium on U.S. use of land mines, except in certain marked areas along international borders.

Encourages additional countries to join the moratorium.

The legislation is sponsored by Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., with 44 co-sponsors representing both parties. Absent from the sponsors list for this wise legislation, which has the active support of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and more than 200 other human rights organizations are the names of Pennsylvania's senators, Arlen Specter and Rick Santorum.

We urge our two Republican senators to join the effort to end this indiscriminate means of warfare, just as the nations of the world have previously agreed to end the use of biological and chemical weapons. America's leadership and example is no less essential to making this a safer and more peaceful world than it was in winning the Cold War.

[From the Rutland Daily Herald, July 6, 1995]  
BAN LAND MINES

The world is slowly waking to the indiscriminate carnage that results from the use of a cheap, easily dispersed and deadly weapon—the land mine.

The question is whether the United States will exercise the leadership required to move the international community toward a total ban of a weapon that kills and maims 26,000 people a year.

There are about 100 million land mines already in place on killing fields around the globe. They create terror on the cheap. They cost between \$3 and \$20 to make, and 80 percent of those killed are children. Long after the battlefields are quiet in Cambodia, Angola, Lebanon and Vietnam, the killing goes on.

Land mines are the weapons of cowards. The Soviet Union spread them by the millions in Afghanistan; some were specifically designed to entice children into picking them up. Now Russia is spreading them in Chechnya.

Sen. Patrick Leahy has played a leading role in prodding the Clinton administration and the international community to bring this hideous technology under control. Legislation introduced by Leahy two years ago led to a moratorium by the United States on the manufacture and sale of land mines and prompted 25 other nations to follow suit. Leahy also introduced a resolution before the U.N. General Assembly on behalf of the United States calling for the "eventual elimination" of land mines.

Now the Clinton administration is backtracking.

Leahy has introduced a bill that would prohibit the United States from using land mines, except in certain specifically designated border areas, and to impose sanctions on nations who use them. He hopes the United States will lead by example, as it did on the manufacturing moratorium, so other nations also disavow use of land mines.

The U.S. military, however, is wary of establishing a precedent. Even though land mines are primarily an instrument of terror aimed at innocent civilians, the Army does not like to have its options limited. Certainly, land mines are not the most important weapon in the U.S. arsenal, but the military does not want Congress to get in the habit of indulging its humanitarian impulses by limiting the weapons the Army can use.

Thus, Clinton has found a way to equivocate.

Though the United States introduced the U.N. resolution favoring the elimination of land mines, Clinton now favors the export and use of self-destructing land mines that would detonate by themselves over time.

Here Clinton indulges in fantasy. Does he really believe the dozens of nations with tens of millions of land mines in their possession will decide they would rather buy more expensive self-destructing mines and use them instead? In this way, Clinton undermines the international effort to eliminate the use of this weapon.

Just four years ago there were only two organizations raising the alarm about land mines. One was the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation whose land mine campaign is led by Jody Williams of Brattleboro. She had seen what land mines do in Nicaragua and El Salvador.

Now there are 350 organizations in 20 countries pushing to eliminate the use of land mines. Pope John Paul II, former President Jimmy Carter, Nobel laureate Desmond Tutu of South Africa, and U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali all support a ban. And yet Clinton backs away.

Leahy's bill would put the U.S. once again at the vanguard of the effort to eliminate what Leahy has called "weapons of mass destruction in slow motion."

Leahy's bill has 44 co-sponsors, including Sen. James Jeffords, but he has still not been assured the bill will come to a vote. It ought to come to a vote, and despite Clinton's equivocation, Congress ought to send the message that the United States will lead the way in containing the violence war causes among the world's innocent bystanders.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in my ongoing effort to see a worldwide ban on the use of antipersonnel landmines, it is interesting to note that since starting this effort 25 countries have taken at least the initial step by halting all or most of their exports of antipersonnel mines. That was due in large part to the action we took here 2 years ago, by passing my amendment to stop U.S. exports of these weapons. Our action captured the attention of the world, and that is why it is important that we continue to show leadership to bring an end to the landmine scourge.

I remind my colleagues that today in over 60 countries there are 100 million antipersonnel landmines that wait silently to explode. These are 100 million not in warehouses but concealed in the ground. In many countries they are clearing the landmines an arm and a leg and a life at a time.

Today when wars end, soldiers leave and tanks and artillery and guns are withdrawn, in so many countries the killing continues, sometimes for months, sometimes long past when people can remember what caused the fighting in the first place. It continues because of the landmines left behind.

We are about to make a major decision in Bosnia. The distinguished Senator from Kansas and I spent most of an afternoon with the President of the United States, with the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, our Ambassador to the United Nations, and General Shalikashvili discussing what alternatives are available to us.

It was a very good discussion, I think a very important discussion. I commend the President for having it. I could not help think throughout no matter who is in Bosnia, whether us, for whatever reason, our allies, whether now or when the fighting stops, they are going to find a very, very grim surprise; that is, hundreds of thousands, perhaps over a million landmines that are now in the former Yugoslavia, and they will keep on killing long after this dreadful fighting stops.

#### THE INTERNET

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there has been a lot said about Internet, and about proposals to regulate indecent or obscene content in the Internet. There has been a lot of articles about so-called cyberporn and things of that nature.

I have had some interest in the way the legislation is proceeding. I believe I was probably the first Senator to actively hold town meetings on the Internet. I have it in my own home, as many do now, and use it continuously, when I am here in my office in Washington, in my office in Vermont, in my home in Vermont, and in the residence here.

REPORT OF INTERACTIVE WORKING GROUP ON PARENTAL EMPOWERMENT, CHILD PROTECTION AND FREE SPEECH IN INTERACTIVE MEDIA

In light of concerns and legislative proposals to regulate indecent and obscene content on the Internet, I have asked the Attorney General of the United States as well as a coalition of private and public interest groups known as the Interactive Working Group to look at this issue and provide recommendations on addressing the problem of children's access to objectionable online material, but to do so in a constitutional and effective manner.

I have not yet heard back from the Attorney General and look forward to receiving the report of the Department of Justice as promptly as their study can be concluded.

I come to the Senate today to speak about the report from the Interactive Working Group that will be released Monday. This group includes online service providers, content providers,

and public interest organizations dedicated to the interactive communications media. I would recommend the report to my colleagues.

In its report, the Interactive Working Group describes some of the technology available, not in the future but today, to help parents supervise their children's activities on the Internet and protect them from objectionable online material. In fact, available blocking technology can make pornographic Usenet news groups or World Wide Web sites off limits to children.

I mention this because we seem to be carried away with the idea that somehow we will set up a Federal standard that will treat everybody exactly the same, whether adult or child, in setting up gateways on the Internet—without accepting the fact that maybe parents have a certain responsibility to raise their children. The responsibility parents have is greater than the Senate or the House of Representatives has, and as a parent, I would readily take on that responsibility rather than to have the Congress tell me what to do.

There are other commercially available products that limit children's access to chat rooms, where they might be solicited. They limit children's ability to receive pornographic pictures through electronic mail.

Other products allow parents to monitor their children's usage of the Internet. You can find out exactly where they have been and what they might have been reading. This is significantly different from other settings where parents may have no idea what magazines or books their children read—but you can find out on the Internet.

Yet some would close down the Internet to prevent the possibility of an infraction. What I am saying is that parents ought to take some responsibility themselves.

Software entrepreneurs and the vibrant forces of the free market are providing tools that can empower parents' to restrict their children's access to offensive material. Parents can restrict access to whatever they considered objectionable: whether it is beer advertising, or fantastic card games that some parents believe promotes interest in the occult. Interested organizations, like the Christian Coalition or Mothers Against Drunk Driving, could provide parents that use blocking technology with lists of sites these groups consider inappropriate for children.

This is not a case where we in Congress, playing big brother or big sister, need to determine what parents should tell their children to watch or read.

If you set up Government regulations, the kind of heavy-handed regulations that we seem intent upon passing, then you will stifle this new industry. If you have overly restrictive bans on the Internet, they will prove not only unconstitutional, but they are going to hamper the growth of this new communications medium, one that has grown faster than anything else I have

seen in my lifetime. The Internet has been growing at an exponential rate and new uses for it are devised daily.

Anyone with a computer and a modem can send something out on the Internet, but unlike a broadcaster, potential listeners must seek out this information and download it. This indecency that we worry about does not come easily into a home. You have to go out and look for it.

We are at the dawn of a new era in communication. Interactive communications—ranging from online computer services, CD-ROM's, and home shopping networks—are growing at an astonishing rate, bringing great opportunities for business, culture, and education. Of all these new interactive communications, the Internet has become the new location for our Nation's discourse.

The Internet does not function like a broadcast or a newspaper where a station manager or editor chooses which images or stories to send out in public. The Internet is like a combination of a great library and town square, where people can make available vast amounts of information or take part in free and open discussions on any topic. It has provided great opportunities for our disabled citizens and has enabled our children the ability to discuss issues with some of society's greatest minds. With this technology, I conduct electronic town meetings with Vermonters, post information about legislative activities, and hear back from Vermonters about what they think.

Unfortunately, like any free and open society, the Internet and online computer services have attracted their share of criminals. I recently introduced with Senators KYL and GRASSLEY the National Information Infrastructure Protection Act to increase protection for our Nation's important computer systems and confidential information from damage or prying by malicious insiders and computer hackers.

In addition, the Internet is not immune from pornographers. Pornography exists in every communications media, including films, books, magazines, and dial-a-porn telephone services. The press has recently hyped the discovery that online pornography exists on the Internet. But we should be careful not to overstate the extent of the problem.

In our universal condemnation of pornography and desire to protect our children from exposure to online pornography, we should not rush in with well-meaning but misguided legislation. Any response we choose must be tempered by first amendment concerns. Heavy-handed attempts to protect children could unduly chill speech on the Internet and infringe upon the first amendment.

What are we doing as a legislative body if we discourage the project Gutenberg from placing online the works of Charles Dickens, Geoffrey Chaucer, or D.H. Lawrence for fear of prosecu-

tion because someone, somewhere on the Internet, might find the works indecent? Would the Internet still be the great electronic library and the setting for open discussion it now promises? These questions and issues will be the subject of an important Judiciary Committee hearing Monday afternoon.

Any legislative approach must take into consideration online users' privacy and free speech interests. If we grant too much power to online providers to screen for indecent material, public discourse and online content in cyberspace will be controlled by the providers and not the users of this fantastic resource. At the same time, we should carefully consider the Interactive Working Group's recommendation that online providers be encouraged to implement reasonable forms of filtering technology. Our laws should encourage and not discourage online providers from creating a safe environment for children.

Even worse than discouraging online providers from implementing blocking technologies, is discouraging them from allowing children onto their services altogether. If online providers are liable for any exposure of indecent material to children, people under the age of 18 will be shut out of this technology or relegated by the Government to sanitized kids-only services that contain only a tiny fraction of the entire Internet. That would be the equivalent of limiting today's students to the childhood section of the library or locking them out completely. This is not how this country should face the increasingly competitive global marketplace of the 21st century.

I do not want somebody to tell me what I can say if I am talking to my neighbor on the Internet, or if I am sending messages back and forth to friends. Frankly, Mr. President, sometimes my friends and I will disagree pretty loudly on the Internet and we will be very frank in our discussion of other's ideas and what not. At what point do we have somebody come on and say you cannot talk like that to each other, someone I have known for 30 years?

With our children, I again say that there are times when the responsibility should be that of parents. Parents know their children better than any Government official, and are in the best position to know the sort of online material to which their children may be exposed.

Finally, the Interactive Working Group's report shows how we can use existing Federal laws to stop online stalkers and child pornographers. Our criminal laws already prohibit the sale or distribution over computer networks of obscene material (18 U.S.C. Secs. 1465, 1466, 2252 and 2423(a)). We already impose criminal liability for transmitting any threatening message over computer networks (18 U.S.C. Sec. 875(c)). We already proscribe the solicitation of minors over computers for any sexual activity (18 U.S.C. Sec.

2452), and illegal luring of minors into sexual activity through computer conversations (18 U.S.C. Sec. 2423(b)). We need to make sure our law enforcement has the training and resources to track down computer criminals, and not create new laws which restrict free speech and are repetitive of existing crimes.

This paper is important because it shows how we can address the problem of online pornography by empowering parents, and not the Government, to screen children's computer activities. This is the best way to police the Internet without unduly restricting free speech or squelching the growth of this fantastic new communications medium.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RYAN WHITE CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Seth Kilbourn, a congressional fellow, be granted privilege of the floor during the debate of the Ryan White CARE Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the consideration of S. 641.

Mr. HELMS. That is the so-called Ryan White bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I shall not speak long, because there is not much time allocated this afternoon to this measure. I am sure that the distinguished majority leader was looking for something to take up for 2 or 3 hours, and I am not going to keep you here very long on this Friday afternoon.

However, I have been listening in my office to the comments of Senators who advocate this legislation. I respect them, but I disagree with them. At a later time, I will go into some detail to explain to all Senators what they will be voting for; indeed, some 62 or 63 Senators are identified as cosponsors of this so-called Ryan White bill. I have talked with 2 or 3 Senators at lunch, and at other times, about the details of the bill. They do not have the foggiest notion what the bill is all about. It just sounds good to be for the Ryan White bill.

Let the RECORD show that I am sorry for people who have AIDS. However, I am not unmindful of how the majority of people get AIDS. I said so in an interview with a woman reporter for the New York Times who called me several weeks ago.

What she really called me about, Mr. President, was clear at the time; she repeatedly brought up Senator DOLE, the majority leader of the U.S. Senate and candidate for President. She was going to write one of those speculative stories, you see, suggesting that Senator DOLE was holding up the so-called Ryan White bill.

The fact is, nobody was holding up the Ryan White bill. Nobody is holding it up right now. I emphasized that, yes, I did put a "notify" hold in the Cloakroom on the Ryan White bill, meaning that I wanted to be notified when the bill was called up so that I could offer amendments to give Senators—including the 60-odd Senators who are cosponsors of the bill, without knowing what they are cosponsoring—give them a chance to vote on a number of questions which are of interest to the vast majority of the American people.

Since the distorted story was published about 80 percent of the thousands of calls and letters I received from around the country have been favorable.

I told the lady from the New York Times that her speculation was preposterous, that BOB DOLE was not holding up the Ryan White bill, that JESSE HELMS was not holding up the Ryan White bill, that, in fact, nobody was holding it up.

I asked, "When has Senator DOLE, the majority leader, had a time to call up this bill?" And, by the way, I said, the existing bill does not expire until September 30, so what is the big rush?

No, it is the homosexual lobby in this country. My hometown paper engaged in an editorial about the weak forces of the homosexual lobby. Well, Mr. President, the homosexual lobby is one of the most potent lobbying outfits in the country.

They talk about little Ryan White—an attractive little boy, an innocent little boy. He died of AIDS, and now his name is being exploited, as if the homosexuals had nothing to do with the tainted blood that killed Ryan White. Where does the New York Times think that the tainted blood came from in the beginning? That is what Senators need to consider before they rush pell-mell into voting for this bill.

There will be at least five or six amendments to consider and to vote on before the Senate gets to final passage on this amendment.

What the homosexual lobbyists in this country are demanding are special advantages over everybody else. The Clinton administration is making a mockery of fair play in kowtowing to the homosexual demands at every turn, which prompts me to wonder, for example, how many Senators—or how many people in the news media, for that mat-

ter—know about the seminars being conducted these days throughout the Federal Government bureaucracy, seminars that are mandatory. Federal employees are penalized if they do not attend them. What are these seminars all about? They are designed to "teach" Federal employees that homosexuality is just another lifestyle.

I have not seen a word about it in the New York Times or the Washington Post, nor have I seen it on CBS, ABC, CNN, or any of the rest of them. You see, it's not politically correct to talk about this.

Federal employees do not have a choice about whether to attend these seminars. They go to them—or else. We had one case last year—and I had to intervene—where a dedicated Federal official stationed in Atlanta was booted out of his job because he made a statement saying that we ought to look for the higher things in life instead of concentrating on homosexuality, and teaching the false doctrine that homosexuality is just another lifestyle.

This homosexual lobby has gone to incredible extremes to exploit Ryan White's name to acquire an unjustified amount of Federal funding for AIDS.

By the way, Mr. President, there has never been another disease for which there has been a special Federal fund for one specifying money not devoted to AIDS research. This money is distributed with substantial amounts going to homosexual organizations such as the Gay Men's Health Crisis in New York, and the Whitman Walker Clinic, right here in Washington, DC.

But just try, Mr. President, to obtain some information out of the Department of Health and Human Services. They stonewall. They do not want anybody to get the facts on how this AIDS money is distributed.

But, later on, the Senate is going into all of this, and in great detail when consideration of this bill begins. There will be no home-free basis. We are going to lay it out for everybody to see.

And if Senators then want to vote for it, fine.

That is all I am going to say today, Mr. President. But I want it to be made a matter of record that this is not a bill that the American people know anything about, nor is it one that many Senators know about. If the Lord gives me strength, the Senators at least will know about it before this reauthorization of the so-called Ryan White is approved by the Senate.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.